

REMARKS

The specification as originally filed recited claim 1-21 and 23-28. In the recent Office Action, the Examiner renumbered the claims to claims 1-27. Therefore, claims 1-27 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-27 currently stand rejected. Claims 16-27 have been amended. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-27 and consideration of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Dependent claims 16-23 are amended herein to properly claim dependence from claim 15. Claims 24-27 are amended herein to properly claim dependence from claim 23.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-27 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 and 63-93 of U.S. patent No. 6,731,744 (Khuc). A terminal disclaimer is included herein to overcome the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-11, 13, 15-16, 20-24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,483,527 (Doshi). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the Examiner's reference to U.S. Patent No. 5,483 (Doshi), The Applicant assumes that the examiner is referring to U.S. Patent No. 5,483,527 in the Notice of References Cited. If the Examiner is referring to another patent application, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's clarification of this point.

Claim 1 recites, in part, receiving signaling for a voice call and processing the signaling to generate a query to a call center. The query is transmitted to the call center and a query response is received wherein the query response includes a packet address. Communications for the voice call are transferred to the call center in packets having the packet address.

Doshi fails to disclose receiving a query response wherein the query response includes a packet address and *transferring communications for the voice call* to the call

center in packets having the *packet address*. Doshi discloses receiving signaling for a voice call and receiving a query response wherein the query response includes a packet address. However, the packet address returned in Doshi is *not* used to transfer communications for the voice call to the call center in packets having the packet address as required by claim 1.

In Doshi, when the CO 25 sends a call setup message (IAM), either a SS7 busy message (col. 5, lines 26-37), or a SS7 call complete message (col. 5, lines 58-65) is returned from ATM switch call processor 215-2. In either case, the message returned from ATM switch call processor 215-2 does not include a packet address that is used to transfer a voice call to ATM switch 215. The packet address used to transfer voice calls to ATM switch 215 is a VPI/VCI (col. 6, lines 5-34). However, ATM switch 215 does not return a VPI/VCI in a response message. Instead, ATM switch 215 uses a predetermined lookup table (Figures 4 and 5) to map between trunks and VPI/VCI port address (col. 6, lines 1-10). Since Doshi does not disclose that the SS7 busy message or the SS7 call complete message contains a VPI/VCI, Doshi does not disclose receiving a query response wherein the query response includes a packet address and transferring communications for the voice call to the call center in packets having the packet address. Therefore, Doshi does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited reference.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable in view of the cited reference, and such indication is respectfully requested. Independent claim 15 is rejected for similar reasons to claim 1. Claim 15 contains limitations similar to claim 1 and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 1. While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 3-5, 8, 12, 14, 17-19, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,483,527 (Doshi). A discussion of this rejection is obviated in view of the discussion above distinguishing Doshi from

independent claims 1 and 15. While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant hereby authorizes the Office to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 the appropriate fee for the Terminal Disclaimer filed herewith. The Applicant believes no additional fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas M. Grover/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Douglas M. Grover, Reg. No. 52,974

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: doug@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe

Sprint Law Department

6450 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461

Overland Park, KS 66251